

SUMMARY OF POULTRY AND EGG MARKETING CONFERENCESIntroduction

This report summarizes the results of four area poultry and egg marketing conferences, which were follow-up meetings for the Memphis Marketing Conference held in November.

The Memphis Conference of Extension workers resulted in the development of sound guiding principles for carrying on Extension's responsibilities in marketing. Principles to guide the Extension workers in their relationships with cooperatives, farm organizations, and private industry were set down. Responsibilities of the Extension Service for assisting producers to establish new and improved marketing systems were enumerated. Consideration was given to the need for Extension's increased attention to marketing in the South in the post-war period.

These poultry and egg marketing conferences were designed to provide an opportunity for State workers to get together and exchange ideas on the marketing program for these products. Several outstanding marketing programs were outlined which may serve as demonstrations for all the South, and a procedure for developing marketing programs was outlined which should help Extension workers bring about a more satisfactory marketing program.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Progress in developing sound and permanent poultry and egg marketing programs varies from State to State. There are numerous demonstrations of programs which have proven successful. These will undoubtedly spread to other areas. The wide variation within the region in production conditions and in marketing opportunities make it essential that marketing developments be adapted to local conditions.

The most difficult problem at present is to handle the heavy spring egg surplus. This requires that some eggs be stored for at least a short period and that the lower quality eggs seek immediate outlets. The storing of eggs is risky, especially for eggs which are not of top quality; the quantity of low quality eggs which can be marketed in frozen or dried form is limited since commercial breakers have learned through experience that they cannot merchandise their product profitably if it consists wholly of low quality eggs. Even though knowledge of consumer preferences and consumer demand is limited, indications are that the local demand for the better grades of eggs could be expanded to absorb a major part of local production during most of the year. In contrast with most of the other States, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas will need to find markets outside of the State for some of their eggs.

It is felt that production in the area might be maintained at relatively high levels but that there will need to be some reduction after the war. A more effective system of marketing to store eggs during the surplus season for later merchandising would have a salutary effect in maintaining production.

Facts concerning production costs are limited, and present knowledge is based largely upon opinion. In order to facilitate the development of marketing programs, the following recommendations were developed: (1) That a survey of consumer demand and consumer preferences for eggs and poultry products be made; (2) That the Experiment Stations develop and carry on an economic study of poultry and egg production in these States as a basis for future programs; (3) That an inventory of facilities used in the marketing of poultry and poultry products be made as a basis for planning for new facilities needed to improve the marketing process; (4) That the establishment of "demonstration" marketing projects be encouraged; and (5) That conferences be arranged in November or December 1945 to provide an opportunity for Extension workers to review progress and outline procedures for future programs.

Purpose of Conferences

1. To consider wartime egg and poultry production trends.
2. To determine post-war requirements, adjustments, and problems.
3. To review production and marketing programs carried on by State Extension Services.
4. To outline procedure for establishing production and marketing programs.

Trends in Production

A review of egg production trends indicates that in most of the Southern States there has been a sharper increase in production since before the war than for the United States as a whole. Production of eggs in the United States in 1944 was 58 percent above pre-war. In this group of States the amount of increase in 1944 over pre war, ranged from 9 percent greater in Florida to 88 percent greater in Oklahoma. (See Table 1 in Appendix)

In each of the States the increased production has resulted from an increase in the number of hens (See Table 2 in Appendix.) The size of flocks has increased, particularly the smaller farm flocks varying in size from 25 to 200 hens. During the same period, there has been an appreciable increase in the rate of lay per hen (See Table 3 in Appendix); and third, there has been some increase in the number of poultry flocks, especially of backyard flocks in urban areas.

Future programs for egg production should take into consideration the following facts:

1. Egg production is now everywhere at very high levels; after the war there will be a need for a drastic national decrease. Egg

production in the South is, however, not sufficient to meet local requirements.

2. The agriculture of the area will tend to shift from cotton to other farming enterprises, with egg and poultry production as a possible alternative.
3. The cost of production and efficiency of marketing within the area will have to meet competition from other production areas.

It is recognized generally that many of the small cotton producers cannot compete at world market prices for cotton in the post-war period. Producers on these small farms will need to adjust their farming operations if they hope to continue to farm in their present locations. It might be expected that egg production would be one of the alternatives that these farmers would choose.

In most territories of the area, the amounts of scratch grains necessary to maintain reasonably sized laying flocks might be produced on the farm, although other types of feed would have to be imported from grain producing sections. If a type of poultry husbandry designed to produce eggs with the greatest degree of efficiency is followed, eggs can be produced in these States and marketed to meet the competition from more remote areas. The problem of small flocks of 20, 30, or 50 hens complicates the marketing of eggs and the efficiency of this type of flock as a commercial enterprise is questionable.

Small flocks predominate in all areas of the South. (See Table 4 in Appendix) The marketing problem is complicated by the large proportion of the eggs coming from small farm flocks. The high seasonality of production and predominance of low quality eggs are both problems originating largely in the small flocks. It is difficult to get producers having only 25 to 50 layers to follow recommended production practices.

On a per capita basis, egg production in most of the States is insufficient to meet the levels recommended by nutritionists, and is considerably below the average for the United States. Although this is not an important factor in determining desired production levels, it is an indication of the possibility of marketing locally a relatively high production of eggs.

The trend in the total production of eggs on a per capita basis in each of the States is indicated in Table 5 in the Appendix. The per capita production of eggs in 1944 in all of the States listed except Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Kentucky is below the U. S. Average of 446. This range between States was between 88 eggs produced per capita in Florida to 806 in Oklahoma, but should not imply, however, that local production should be stepped up to supply local demands. It should indicate that marketing programs might be developed to provide good local outlets for eggs produced in these deficit areas.

Another comparison worthy of attention is presented in Table 8 (Appendix). This table suggests that, although on an annual basis most of the Southern States are deficient in the production of eggs, supplies are plentiful in most areas in the season of high production. Production in spring months is about three times the production in winter months. A more even production pattern or a program to store eggs of high quality during the heavy production season should be a part of the egg marketing program of the South.

Post War Problems

Relative to egg production some of the post war problems which face producers in the South appear to be:

1. The need for increased farm income.
2. Whether to retain total egg and poultry production at present levels which are higher than prewar levels.
3. The elimination of spring market gluts due to the heavy seasonal production and marketings from small farm flocks.
4. Finding other market outlets for the surplus (especially the lower quality) eggs when the volume taken by egg-driers is cut to a mere fraction of present takings.
5. The present lack of adequate egg storage facilities and egg storage programs in the South, to encourage the year-around consumption of locally-produced eggs.

Developing a Poultry and Egg Marketing Program

The following outline suggests a procedure for developing egg marketing programs, assuming the worker is starting as a beginner in this field.

1. Spend some time becoming acquainted with the trade--learning where they buy, how they buy, where they sell, and how they sell. Become acquainted with all their problems of securing supplies, and of handling these supplies.
2. Study the agriculture and geography of the State. Work with the farm management and production people to become acquainted with the peculiarities of the soil, crops, livestock and people. Try to find out about the income problems of the farm people.
3. Study the pattern of production and marketing existing in the State. Divide the State into areas of concentrated and non-concentrated production. Get prices received in each area in relation to terminal markets, both near-by and distant. Study

size of flocks, breeds, and other factors pertinent to production. Study the sources of procurement from farms or assembly points.

4. Select a favorable marketing area to establish a marketing demonstration. In selecting this area, consider:

- A. Location in relation to outlet.
 - a. Transportation, etc.
- B. Volume of production.
- C. Size of flock.
- D. Quality of product.
- E. Need for marketing service.
- F. Attitude and type of producer (producers' committee)

5. Develop a marketing system giving attention to:

- A. Method of concentration.
 - a. From producers.
 - b. From assembly points.
- B. Develop quality program with producers.
 - a. Pay producers on grade (or quality).
 - b. Standardized flocks.
 - c. Modern housing and equipment program.
 - d. Gathering and care of eggs on farm.
 - e. Infertile eggs.
 - f. Frequent marketing.
- C. Educational program with handlers
 - a. Suitable holding space
 - b. Proper handling methods and use of facilities
- D. Merchandising (shell eggs)
 - a. Storage operations
 - b. Sales to and by wholesalers
 - c. Sales to and by retailers
 - d. Sales to Army, hospitals, hotels, and institutions.
 - e. Sales to breakers and driers.
- E. Consumer education program

The highly seasonal pattern of egg production in these States which results in "surpluses" in the spring, and deficits in the fall and winter, makes difficult the development of a satisfactory marketing program. Several suggestions which might well receive attention in attacking this problem are listed below:

- 1. Develop programs companion to the operations of other marketing, purchasing or merchandising organizations, cooperatively or privately owned.
- 2. Develop plans to:
 - A. Grade, pack and store the good eggs during the flush season of production.

- B. Merchandise through current outlets or break and freeze the eggs which would not stand up in shell storage.
- C. Develop consumer education campaigns to encourage an expanded consumption of eggs and a proper understanding of egg grades.
- D. Develop producer education programs as outlined above.

3. Develop production programs to eliminate the high seasonality of production through:

- A. Earlier brooding
- B. Improved feeding practices
- C. Shade and protection from heat
- D. Culling

Marketing Programs

There are 4 "demonstration" marketing programs which are worthy of study by all people interested in developing poultry and egg marketing programs. A more detailed discussion of these programs will be found under the State headings. A few comments here concerning some of the outstanding features of these programs may be worth while.

Hattiesburg, Miss. The program built around this moderately sized southern city provides an excellent demonstration for other areas where conditions are similar. It is built around a farmers' supply cooperative which services 6 or 7 surrounding counties. Several operating principles are demonstrated in this experience:

1. That consumer education regarding quality eggs is essential if egg transactions are to be made on a graded basis. This experiment demonstrated that this demand can be built up.
2. With producers selling on a graded basis, the proportion of high quality eggs marketed by producers has increased materially and it might be assumed that producer prices have improved.
3. It is not necessary to think in terms of concentrating eggs in large volumes in large terminal markets to process them before merchandising them in outlying markets. A program can be established around centers with a reasonably large concentration of population. With the present volume of production, local consumption will absorb the major part of local production if orderly marketing programs were developed.
4. A practical educational program with producers on egg quality has been developed

North Carolina - North Carolina through a federation of supply cooperatives, provides a demonstration of a possible way to assemble eggs from all producers over a wide area.

1. The organization contracts with local handlers of any type thus making it possible for producers to continue with their usual marketing practices.
2. An outlet is provided for producers with any volume.
3. Eggs are assembled in sufficient volume to be marketed at wholesale.
4. No merchandising program has been carried on to date, but one could easily be developed to carry on in connection with the present program.

South Carolina - In contrast with the North Carolina program, South Carolina, through cooperation with Dixie Home Stores is developing a program which will provide both an assembly method and a merchandising program. Both the North Carolina and South Carolina experience deserves careful study. Elements of both have possibilities in all sections of the South.

Virginia - Virginia's 20 years of experience provides evidence that egg marketing programs can be developed under conditions which predominate in the South. One of the first important steps is to seek an outlet, and develop it. The Virginia workers have found it necessary to carry on an intensive consumer campaign in Washington and to build a program on a solid foundation.

Marketing Programs of All States Participating in the Regional Conferences

Texarkana Conference

Arkansas

Mr. Kumpe indicated that prior to 1941, eggs produced in Arkansas had been sold in local markets, and as these outlets were easily satisfied, gluts frequently occurred. Only 3 out of 37 licensed dealers, who early agreed to cooperate in the price support program actually handled eggs in 1941. Later, however, a program was developed with Armour and Company who sold their purchases of Arkansas eggs largely to the Kroger Grocery Company. There were 30 cooperative and 3 private dealers who operated buying stations under the egg-purchase program in 1944. They handled from 10 to 200 cases weekly. Small producers in Arkansas have generally not been interested in a grading program, chiefly, because it is necessary to wait for their returns. The 1945 program for Arkansas is to purchase eggs on a graded basis. Three grading schools will be held in anticipation of the need for trained graders.

There is a need for close cooperation between the educational and regulatory agencies if a well-balanced marketing program is to be developed.

Arkansas has a marketing committee which has been helpful with the marketing problems. This committee is composed of representatives of the railroad companies, Farm Bureau Federation, the cooperatives, Farm Credit Administration, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and the War Food Administration.

Oklahoma

Mr. Jacob outlined a program which had been developed for marketing eggs in Oklahoma covering the following points:

1. Purchase on a grade basis.
2. Continue work which has been done to date with governmental agencies and other States.
3. Start marketing programs at carefully selected spots.
4. Interest all agencies concerned.
5. Obtain proper facilities.
6. Establish adequate assembly systems.
7. Carry the returns back to the producers directly and quickly.
8. Educate the consumers relative to the value of egg quality as evidenced by grades.

In future market developments in Oklahoma, a system of marketing eggs cooperatively could possibly be developed in connection with the cooperative creamery and dairy associations. An attempt will be made to develop such a marketing program in Oklahoma.

Texas

Messrs. Moore and Jaynes stated that there has been very little progressive development in the marketing of poultry products in Texas. There are, however, several places in the State where there is a sufficient concentration of poultry, turkey, and egg production that there are possibilities there for constructive work. Mr. Moore and Mr. Jaynes were eager to obtain suggestions regarding the proper approach to a marketing program for such selected areas.

New Orleans Conference

Louisiana

Mr. C. L. Flowers stated that the chief marketing problem in Louisiana was due to the high seasonality of egg production. Although production of eggs is insufficient for the year-around requirements the heavy production during the late winter and early spring months results in short-time local market gluts.

L644

The heaviest poultry areas coincide for the most part with the rice-producing areas. The largest flocks are located in Beauregard Parish. There are egg cooperatives in the following parishes: West Carroll, Rapides, and Union. There is an egg-drying plant located in Lincoln Parish.

With regard to the 10-Case Program, Mr. Flowers stated that this did not work out satisfactorily in Louisiana because too many dirty eggs were marketed. Mr. Flowers stated that the minimum number of hens needed for successful operation of local coop associations to market eggs was 40,000.

Mr. Ingram stated that in his opinion, flocks of two sizes are to be recommended for Louisiana: (1) Family-size flocks of from 15 to 25 hens, of which 2/3 should be pullets and (2) income-size flocks of 100 or more hens. There should be more uniform production of eggs throughout the year. Programs to encourage the production of eggs and poultry for home consumption and for commercial production have been developed by the University of Louisiana and published material distributed on these two subjects.

Mr. W. W. Roberts, Secretary of the State Market Commission, discussed the program of the recently established State Marketing Commission. He discussed also the program of the Oak Grove Egg Cooperative in West Carroll Parish where there was a definite need for a quality program. At the Oak Grove Cooperative, no pick-up service is used. Mr. Roberts emphasized the fact that one cent per dozen is the maximum cost which eggs can stand for assembling them from farms.

Mississippi

Mr. C. A. Roberts reported on marketing in Mississippi. There are important poultry production areas around Hattiesburg, Booneville, Senatchia, and Grenada. Mr. Roberts sees the need for a number of egg assembling points in the State. An effort is now being made to establish such assembly points with trucks to pick-up the eggs on a county-wide collection basis. To date the only important assembly point which is built around a farmers coop is at Hattiesburg.

Under this program the volume of Grade A eggs handled has increased 20 percent in three years. This cooperative venture provides an outstanding demonstration in marketing eggs in the South. Mr. Roberts sees the need also for a number of killing and dressing plants properly located in the State.

Mr. F. Z. Beanblossom described in some detail the operations of the cooperative association at Hattiesburg. This association now has about 1,000 members. It is sponsoring a carefully worked out educational program

on quality. Egg grading slips are prepared on each lot of eggs. One of these copies is sent to the county agent in the county where a producer of the poor quality eggs is located. The county agent sends the producer a form letter developed by the Extension poultryman which gives the grower information relative to correcting the cause of the low quality eggs. Mr. Beanblossom feels that there is a need for a poultry dressing plant in Lee County which would have a capacity of from 10 to 15 thousand birds a week.

With regard to flock size the Mississippi delegates expressed the opinion that the recommended size of the commercial flock should not be too definitely stated, but that flock size should vary according to a number of individual farm factors and that the objective should be to encourage flocks which would be efficient and economical units of production.

Alabama

Mr. Baldwin stated that 97.2 percent of the eggs produced in Alabama come from flocks of less than 100 hens. Most of the eggs are produced in the counties north of Birmingham. The heaviest producing section is in the two rows of counties along the northern border. Mr. Baldwin stated that Alabama eggs have a bad reputation in storage. The Alabama bakers use about 5 carloads of frozen eggs a week which could provide an outlet for products from egg-breaking plants in the State.

Mr. Baldwin stated that there are two problems in Alabama: (1) that of handling the temporary spring surplus and (2) the development of a long-time marketing program.

With regard to the spring surplus problem, a program has been developed covering the following points:

1. The Extension Service sponsors a market clinic for the poultry industry in January or February, to which are invited members of the egg trade, feed dealers, processors, county agents, and others.
2. A State-wide hen and rooster culling program.
3. Purchase of eggs on the basis of quality.
4. The establishment of assembling plants.
5. The use of present assemblers to obtain the necessary volumes.
6. Education of the producers regarding the proper handling and marketing of eggs.
7. A training program for egg graders with the assistance of the representatives of cooperatives, War Food Administration, and State Department of Agriculture.
8. Assist with the egg price-support program.
9. Encouragement of individuals relative to using cold-storage lockers to keep eggs for home use.
10. Work with frozen locker plants regarding proper egg storage.
11. Use of frozen locker plants for temporary storage.
12. Sponsor a producer-consumer campaign.

Mr. Baldwin described the recently formed Cullman County Producers' Association of Cullman, Ala. It is to be part of the facilities to be constructed out of the \$300,000 fund set up by the State Legislature, to be used for establishing facilities for marketing Alabama farm products. A fruit and vegetable warehouse has been established at Cullman and it is proposed that a cold storage plant and an egg and poultry plant will be added.

Athens Conference

North Carolina

During the past 3 years, two cooperative farm organizations in the eastern and Piedmont sections of North Carolina have federated into an egg marketing cooperative for the purpose of assembling eggs in order to facilitate farmers' receiving support prices for them. In 1944 three trucks were employed to pick up eggs assembled at 200 pick-up stations at regular intervals, and deliver them to Durham, N. C., where they were graded and sold through commercial channels, to a dryer, or to the War Food Administration at support prices. Under this program, about 150 thousand cases were assembled from the pick-up stations and approximately 100 thousand of these were sold to the dryer. The cooperatives announced the buying price for eggs weekly. Farmers delivered their eggs to pick-up stations and were paid on the current receipt basis, unless they delivered them in case lots, or took them to the station at Durham.

It is recognized that the egg marketing problem is not an emergency, but one that has been in the picture for many years, and probably will recur annually during the heavy production season. For this reason steps have been taken to develop a permanent type program. In 1945, rather than having two concentration points, four have been established. Four truck routes operating from these concentrating points will assemble eggs from about 300 to 350 pick-up stations. The outlet being depended upon this year will be the War Food Administration support program, although an attempt will be made to establish merchandising programs.

A study is being made of the need for frozen eggs in the State. The amount being used by bakeries, candy manufacturers, etc., and consideration is also being given to the possibility of storage during the heavy production period to distribute during the short season.

Another phase of the program which is being encouraged is the establishment of curb markets where small producers can dispose of their products.

South Carolina

In 1944 there were 6 grading stations operating in South Carolina. Three new ones have been established for 1945. In 1945 a chain store operating out of Greenville will maintain a full licensed grader in their warehouse at this point. This chain will buy eggs at all of their stores throughout

the State on a current receipt basis. They operate in 80 percent of the counties in the State. Each of these stores are served twice a week by wholesale trucks operating out of Greenville. These trucks will transport the eggs from the local store to the Greenville store to be graded into consumer grades and returned to the store for retail trade. This will provide an outlet for about 2,000 cases of eggs a week. The chain will break out the low grade eggs. In the eastern part of the State, a farmers cooperative will grade and pack eggs for 2 large chain stores operating in the State. There is a need for storage space for eggs in South Carolina.

Georgia

In 1944 there were 5 or 6 buying stations established under the 10-Case Egg Program. About 40 thousand cases of eggs were sold to the War Food Administration. The greatest problem in Georgia is to establish a satisfactory way for moving eggs from the farms to the stores, and handling in the stores in order to conserve the quality of the eggs. At the present time there is only one handler in Georgia purchasing eggs on grades. This organization is located in Atlanta. One of the necessary steps is to carry on a consumer education program to inform consumers of the quality features of eggs. There are several points within the State where egg programs have developed around a handler interested in the problem. Of course, there are numerous buyers in Atlanta accepting eggs from assemblers in Georgia, as well as importing eggs from other producing areas. An independent handler in Gainesville, Ga. began operations in 1944. This operator performs all of the functions of marketing including breaking and freezing.

A possibility for further development is the central cotton cooperative in Atlanta, whose management is interested in handling eggs, and is at the present time establishing county warehouses throughout the State.

Florida

Production on an annual basis does not meet local requirements, although some surplus develops in the spring. In general, prices of eggs in Florida are based upon Jacksonville quotations issued by the State Marketing Bureau. The system of marketing which has grown up in the State is as follows. Produce buyers, grocers, etc., buy from farmers, purchasing them on a graded basis as well as on a current receipt basis. Egg truckers from the concentrated population areas such as Miami and Tampa pick up eggs from the produce buyers and grade and retail them in the highly populated centers. The seasonal surplus problem is greatest in the western and northern part of the State, although the most concentrated area of production extends in a 100 mile stretch between Jacksonville and Tampa. At the present time also there is less truck movement from this area due to the difficult transportation situation. An inventory of the facilities in the State indicates that there are three commercial storage plants handling eggs in Jacksonville and one in Tampa. There are numerous handlers of poultry and poultry products operating within the State. Small killing and dressing plants for current consumption poultry are located in all of the larger cities. There are no egg breaking or drying plants in the State. The facilities for grading and candling are adequate at the present time with about 15 Federal grading stations operating in the southern part of the State.

Roanoke Conference

Marketing of Poultry Products in Tennessee

Mr. J. C. Powell described the marketing of poultry products in his State. There are two egg-drying plants in the State and eleven poultry dressing plants which dress from 25,000 to 30,000 pounds of poultry a day. One of the dressing plants is located at Cookeville which dresses poultry for about 50 retail stores in New York City. Most of the poultry plants handle eggs also. There are no cooperative associations in the State which handle eggs. The egg auction established at Knoxville some years ago was discontinued because of a lack of volume.

The Tennessee Poultry Producers Association, a cooperative located at Greenville, is engaged chiefly in the marketing of live poultry. It has been an important factor in the marketing of poultry in Northeastern Tennessee. There are several areas in the State, especially in the so-called "Highland Rim Section," where poultry and egg production is quite concentrated. One of these areas which may have possibilities for developing a marketing program is near Cleveland, Tenn. There is a possibility that some egg and poultry marketing might be done in connection with the cooperative marketing of dairy products in the Nashville area. These possibilities are deserving of study.

Virginia

The marketing of poultry products in Virginia was discussed by Mr. Cecil Rogers, Senior Supervisor, Poultry and Egg Marketing of Virginia, Dr. Gordon H. Ward, Marketing Specialist of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and by Mr. Schultz, Manager of the Roanoke Branch of the Southern States Marketing Cooperative.

Dr. Ward discussed the historical development of the marketing of eggs on a quality basis which began in 1927. The early grading work was done by local receiving stations which were often cooperative. After some evolution the plan has developed into one with central grading stations employing full-licensed graders. There has been a remarkable improvement in the quality of eggs received at the grading stations. At first, only 10 to 15 percent of the eggs were of Grade A quality; now about 60 percent are of Grade A quality, with over 90 percent in this grade in the fall of 1944.

Mr. Rogers discussed the Federal-State grading service in Virginia. This service had a substantial development before the war, when there were from 60 to 62 grading stations in operation. There are now about 42 such grading stations in the State. About 20 percent of the eggs produced in the State are marketed through the Federal-State grading programs. Full-time supervised grading service under full licensed graders is now available in Roanoke, Richmond, Danville, Glade Spring, Norfolk, Washington, D. C., and Harrisonburg. There are limited licensed graders in about 45 receiving and assembling stations in the State. The limited license graders candle and

grade locally; the eggs are then sent to central stations to be checked by sample by the full-licensed grader. By means of a control stamp the work done by each grader can be identified and checked. About 70 percent of the limited-licensed graders are now girls. Under the receiving station program the farmers do no candling but sort the eggs for size and do some shell cleaning. The local receiving stations receive shipments of eggs from producers in any quantity and in any type container. In Washington, D. C., there are eleven licensed handlers of Virginia Federal-State eggs.

The Virginia program has been developed, to a large extent, around Washington, D. C. as an outlet. The map of Virginia presents pictorially the way the program works. Dots represent assembly points where grading is performed by a limited-licensed grader. These dots are connected to concentration points, such as Roanoke, where eggs are concentrated, for merchandising purposes. In Roanoke, eggs may be cartoned for shipment to retail outlets in Washington, or they may be shipped in case lots to Washington wholesalers.

In developing the Virginia program, educational programs with consumers and handlers was very important. Consumers had to be encouraged to demand "federally" inspected eggs, and after years of education Washington has come to be one of the higher quality egg markets.

According to Mr. Rogers, a minimum of 50 cases of eggs a week is necessary for the operation of a local grading station. Such a grading station should serve an area not greater than 25 miles in diameter. It would need only a room 8x10 feet in size and a minimum of equipment. Eggs should be moved out of the grading stations three times a week during the hot weather. Mr. Rogers emphasized that it takes a long time to develop a satisfactory grading and marketing program. He emphasized also the fact that quality production and marketing and consumer education must go hand in hand.

Mr. Schultz described some of the details of the Southern States Cooperative's egg marketing program. They are attempting to encourage producers to size their eggs by paying a bonus of 1 cent per dozen and to encourage volume shipments by paying a volume bonus of 1/2 cents per dozen for shipments of 60 dozens or more. The eggs are paid for on a flat case basis as determined by inspection and not according to the individual case "break-down." They encourage the production of eggs during the low production season by paying heavier patronage refunds during the short season than during the flush season. For instance, in 1944 the short season patronage refund was 55 cents per case; for the flush season it was 10 cents per case. About 70 percent of the Southern States' eggs which are sold in Washington, D. C., are sold according to U. S. Grades.

In the opinion of the Virginia representatives, the Bristol area presented a very definite problem in the price-support program. This is due to the fact that unless the Tennessee handlers cooperate with the Virginia handlers the Bristol receivers will be swamped with eggs from Tennessee.

APPENDIX

Texarkana, Arkansas - January 15-16, 1945

Those in Attendance:

A. W. Jacob, Marketing Specialist, Stillwater, Oklahoma
M. C. Jaynes, Marketing Specialist, College Station, Texas
J. O. Kumpe, Marketing Specialist, Little Rock, Arkansas
H. I. Miller, Marketing Specialist, Washington, D. C.
S. W. Moore, Poultry Husbandman, College Station, Texas
J. J. Scanlan, Poultry Section, FCA, Washington, D. C.
R. N. Steilpnagel, Marketing Specialist, OMS, Dallas, Texas
C. C. Warren, Dairy and Poultry Branch, Washington, D. C.
H. G. Ware, Poultry Specialist, Stillwater, Oklahoma

New Orleans, Louisiana - January 22-23, 1945

Those in Attendance:

J. Dan Baldwin, Marketing Specialist, Auburn, Alabama
F. Z. Beamblossom, Poultry Specialist, State College, Mississippi
M. A. Booker, FCA, New Orleans, Louisiana
Harry Dearing, Agricultural Engineer, Birmingham, Alabama
Dan Durham, Feed Dealer and Hatcheryman, New Orleans, Louisiana
C. L. Flowers, Assistant Marketing Specialist, Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Clyde Ingram, Extension Poultryman, Baton Rouge, Louisiana
B. C. Lee, State Department of Agriculture, Crystal Springs, Mississippi
Hermon I. Miller, Marketing Specialist, Washington, D. C.
H. O. Pate, FCA, New Orleans, Louisiana
C. A. Roberts, Marketing Specialist, State College, Mississippi
W. W. Roberts, State Market Commission, Baton Rouge, Louisiana
J. J. Scanlan, Poultry Section, FCA, Washington, D. C.
H. L. Shrader, Poultry Specialist, Washington, D. C.
M. M. Truxillo, Milk Market Administrator, New Orleans, Louisiana
C. C. Warren, Dairy and Poultry Branch, Washington, D. C.

Athens, Georgia - January 25-26, 1945

Those in Attendance:

J. C. Bell, Head of Poultry Department, Athens, Georgia
H. W. Bennett, Extension Poultryman, Athens, Georgia
W. W. Elliott, Office of Supply, Atlanta, Georgia
C. G. Garner, Marketing Specialist, Athens, Georgia
H. L. Meacham, Marketing Specialist, Raleigh, North Carolina
N. R. Mehrhof, Head of Poultry Division, Gainesville, Florida
H. I. Miller, Marketing Specialist, Washington, D. C.
C. F. Parrish, Poultry Specialist, Raleigh, North Carolina
F. W. Risher, State Marketing Bureau, Jacksonville, Florida
J. J. Scanlan, Poultry Section, FCA, Washington, D. C.
H. L. Shrader, Poultry Specialist, Washington, D. C.
L. I. Skinner, Assistant Director of Extension, Athens, Georgia
W. A. Tuten, Marketing Specialist, Columbia, South Carolina
C. C. Warren, Dairy and Poultry Branch, Washington, D. C.
L. T. Wells, Dairy and Poultry Branch, Atlanta, Georgia

Roanoke, Virginia - January 30-31

Those in Attendance:

A. J. Chadwell, Extension Poultryman, Knoxville, Tennessee
H. I. Miller, Marketing Specialist, Washington, D. C.
Harry L. Moore, Extension Poultryman, Blacksburg, Virginia
J. C. Powell, Marketing Specialist, Knoxville, Tennessee
Cecil Rogers, Senior Supervisor, Poultry & Egg Mktg., Virginia and Washington, D. C.
J. J. Scanlan, Poultry Section, FCA, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Schultz, Southern States Marketing Cooperative, Roanoke, Virginia
H. L. Shrader, Poultry Specialist, Washington, D. C.
Gordon H. Ward, Marketing Specialist, Blacksburg, Virginia
C. C. Warren, Dairy and Poultry Branch, Washington, D. C.

Table 1 - Trends in Farm Egg Production, Average 1935-39 and Yearly Since 1940

Area	Number of eggs 1935-39 average	Percent each year is of 1935-39 average				
		1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
	(Millions)					
Texas	2,010	114.8	120.9	139.7	160.0	173.0
Oklahoma	887	110.8	124.4	152.1	170.2	187.7
Arkansas	532	107.3	111.5	130.8	141.9	151.7
Louisiana	270	105.2	112.2	129.3	144.4	153.3
Mississippi	462	94.6	101.3	118.2	139.2	143.5
Alabama	491	99.0	108.4	128.9	158.2	149.3
Georgia	471	111.3	108.1	131.8	146.1	149.3
Florida	192	106.8	101.6	109.9	117.7	108.9
North Carolina	618	108.7	115.7	134.6	163.4	165.2
South Carolina	236	107.6	112.7	126.7	138.1	150.4
Kentucky	803	105.7	111.1	140.0	160.4	158.2
Tennessee	748	93.6	108.3	129.7	156.6	154.4
Virginia	820	105.7	106.1	118.9	124.5	129.9
U. S.	36,381	108.8	114.8	132.8	148.9	158.1

Table 2 - Trends in Hen Numbers, ^{1/} Average 1935-39 and Yearly Since 1940

Area	Number of hens 1935-39 average	Percent each year is of 1935-39 average				
		1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
	(Thousands)					
Texas	17,371	110.7	112.6	129.6	146.2	157.5
Oklahoma	7,356	107.1	113.8	135.7	152.9	160.4
Arkansas	5,199	104.3	104.2	122.5	133.5	141.4
Louisiana	2,813	103.8	110.1	126.7	141.5	146.6
Mississippi	4,720	101.3	101.5	115.8	137.9	141.4
Alabama	4,594	101.4	104.4	122.0	148.9	142.8
Georgia	4,583	112.9	106.3	127.5	141.0	139.6
Florida	1,536	104.1	99.8	105.3	112.4	104.8
North Carolina	5,675	104.5	109.3	126.2	150.3	155.3
South Carolina	2,369	104.9	109.0	119.5	133.3	141.2
Kentucky	6,830	101.2	97.5	120.8	136.7	134.3
Tennessee	6,788	93.4	97.5	113.4	135.9	133.8
Virginia	6,412	100.1	97.1	107.4	113.7	118.2
U. S.	282,953	104.7	106.2	120.3	134.5	138.1

^{1/} Average number of hens on farms during year.

Table 3 - Trend in Annual Rate of Lay, Average 1935-39 and
Annually Since 1940

Area	Eggs per layer	Percent each year is of 1935-39 average				
	1935-39 average	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
	(Number)					
Texas	115	104.3	107.8	108.7	110.4	110.4
Oklahoma	121	103.3	109.1	111.6	110.7	116.5
Arkansas	102	102.9	106.9	106.9	106.9	107.8
Louisiana	96	101.0	102.1	102.1	102.1	104.2
Mississippi	98	92.9	100.0	102.0	101.0	101.0
Alabama	107	97.2	103.7	105.6	106.5	104.7
Georgia	103	98.1	101.0	102.9	103.9	106.8
Florida	125	102.4	101.6	104.0	104.8	104.0
North Carolina	109	103.7	105.5	106.4	108.3	106.4
South Carolina	100	102.0	103.0	106.0	103.0	106.0
Kentucky	118	104.2	113.6	115.3	116.9	116.9
Tennessee	110	100.0	110.9	114.5	115.5	115.5
Virginia	128	105.5	109.4	110.9	109.4	110.2
U. S.	130	103.6	108.5	110.7	110.0	113.2

Table 4 - Trend in Per Capita Egg Production, Average 1935-39 and
Yearly Since 1940

Area	Number of eggs					
	1935-39 average	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Arkansas	277	293	299	351	404	454
Oklahoma	377	421	482	609	697	806
Texas	323	360	369	419	461	505
Alabama	175	172	184	215	269	260
Louisiana	118	120	123	137	152	163
Mississippi	218	200	210	245	288	305
Florida	112	108	98	99	95	88
Georgia	154	168	160	193	213	218
North Carolina	179	188	197	233	278	289
South Carolina	127	134	134	148	167	185
Kentucky	292	298	316	403	471	483
Virginia	309	324	309	323	332	333
Tennessee	266	240	274	330	396	402
U. S.	308	330	343	392	434	465

Table 5 - Number of Farms Reporting Poultry Flocks of Various Sizes, 1940 Census

State	Number	Farms reporting				Percent having
		Less than 25	25 to 49	50 to 99	100 and more	
		46	36	14	4	
Arkansas	193,908	46	36	14	4	
Oklahoma	164,838	24	32	28	6	
Texas	369,876	27	29	26	8	
Alabama	211,126	56	32	9	3	
Louisiana	133,293	49	33	14	4	
Mississippi	251,393	62	29	8	1	
Florida	42,502	50	30	12	8	
Georgia	195,788	52	35	10	3	
North Carolina	235,122	54	33	10	3	
South Carolina	123,914	59	29	9	3	
Kentucky	222,126	39	36	20	5	
Tennessee	219,278	42	34	18	6	
Virginia	153,471	41	32	17	10	

Source: Adapted from U. S. Census.

Table 6 - Trend in Number of Turkeys Raised, Average 1935-39 and Yearly Since 1940

Area	Number (Thousands)	Percent each year is of 1935-39 average				
		1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Texas	3,834	114.7	95.2	97.1	97.1	
Oklahoma	1,411	106.3	90.4	79.5	67.6	
Arkansas	100	125.0	131.0	140.0	126.0	
Louisiana	64	161.6	103.1	114.1	120.3	
Mississippi	117	99.1	116.8	122.2	110.3	
Alabama	139	92.8	111.5	122.3	122.3	
Georgia	123	93.5	95.1	113.8	136.6	
Florida	119	100.8	96.6	96.6	100.8	
North Carolina	234	102.1	102.1	114.5	103.0	
South Carolina	143	111.9	99.3	108.4	124.5	
Kentucky	380	81.6	81.6	81.6	66.8	
Tennessee	212	94.8	100.5	92.5	94.3	
Virginia	730	110.3	110.3	123.6	117.4	
U. S.	27,006	126.7	124.4	122.6	122.3	

Table 7 - Trend in Number of Commercial Broilers Produced,
Average 1935-39 and Yearly Since 1940

Area	Number	Percent each year is of 1935-39 average					
		1935-39 average	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
	(Thousands)						
Texas	3,300	181.8	212.1	287.9	316.7		
Oklahoma	1,340	134.3	149.3	186.6	205.2		
Arkansas	4,560	190.8	285.1	241.2	308.8		
Louisiana	400	150.0	175.0	275.0	385.0		
Mississippi	190	429.5	623.7	728.9	1,093.7		
Alabama	--	--	--	--	--		
Georgia	1,060	330.2	566.0	943.4	1,509.4		
Florida	1,320	227.3	265.2	331.4	378.8		
North Carolina	2,470	178.1	249.4	364.4	546.6		
South Carolina	1,000	200.0	250.0	325.0	375.0		
Kentucky	500	170.0	200.0	230.0	230.0		
Tennessee	1,300	126.9	138.5	153.8	192.3		
Virginia	6,000	200.0	233.3	291.7	367.5		
U. S.	69,687	189.1	247.5	294.7	361.1		

Monthly Per Capita Egg Production By States, 1944

Area	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Arkansas	25	36	61	65	61	48	40	36	30	25	17	14
Oklahoma	56	77	105	105	99	75	60	51	46	47	42	42
Texas	29	45	67	70	64	51	42	35	31	30	22	20
Alabama	14	22	34	34	33	28	24	20	16	13	11	11
Louisiana	7	13	22	23	22	17	15	12	10	9	6	6
Mississippi	16	25	41	44	40	31	26	23	19	15	12	11
Florida	7	9	11	11	10	8	7	6	5	5	4	5
Georgia	13	18	26	28	28	23	20	17	14	12	9	9
North Carolina	16	25	38	38	34	27	25	22	20	17	13	12
South Carolina	10	16	23	24	21	18	16	15	12	11	9	9
Kentucky	35	47	64	65	57	41	34	31	28	27	25	27
Tennessee	28	39	54	54	46	36	32	28	24	22	19	19
Virginia	25	30	39	42	38	29	26	23	21	19	19	21